

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/684,076	10/08/2000	Jonathan Cherneff	0544MH-36339	2872	
7590 09/20/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER W. KENNERLY, ESQ.			STIMPAK, JOHNNA		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600			3623		
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004		

> Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/684,076	CHERNEFF ET AL.				
nance, y neaen	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Johnna R Stimpak	3623				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 16 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-45.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•				
10. Other:		- 11				
		TARIO R. HAFIZ RVISORY PATENT EXAMINER CHNOLOGY CENTER 3600				

Application No. **∮**09/684,076

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicants concern that "all words must be considered in judging the patentability of a claim against prior art", examiner respectfully submits that each and every word was considered upon examination of the claims but it was determined that that fact that the product is part of a plurality of products does not patentably distinguish over the prior art. As claimed, the method is applied to a [singular] product in a plurality of products wherein completion dates, and tasks for developing the product are received. Examiner also submits that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the method disclosed in the Mahapatro-Dietrich combination would be repeated for each product developed since it is old and well known that more than one product is developed within a company.